



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Grudnitski, et al.

Examiner: Saadat, Cameron

Serial No.: 09/922,223

Group Art Unit: 3713

Filed: 08/01/2001

Our Ref: LLI001

For: "Method and System for Interactive Case and Video-Based Teacher Training"

RE: **RESPONSE**

Hon. Assistant Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

RESPONSE

Dear Examiner:

A telephonic interview was conducted on August 9, 2004. Pursuant to MPEP § 713.04, this response includes a summary of the interview. Additionally, in response to the Office Action dated March 10, 2004, having a shortened-statutory response period extending through and including June 10, 2004, with extensions extending through and including September 10, 2004, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the following remarks. **All amendments and remarks herein are made without prejudice.**

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action of March 10, 2004, wherein:

- A. Claims 1-2, 10, 17, 24, 25, 33, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement;

RECEIVED
SEP 17 2004
TECHNOLOGY CENTER R3700

- 5 B. Claims 1-2, 10, 17, 24, 25, 33, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second
paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly
claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention; and
- 10 C. Claims 1-8, 10-15, 17-31, 33-38, and 40-46 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
as being unpatentable over Mortimer et al. (USPN 6,091,930; hereinafter
Mortimer) in view of Papadopoulos (USPN 6,099,320; hereinafter
Papadopoulos).

5

SUMMARY OF TELEPHONIC INTERVIEW

A telephonic interview was conducted on August 9, 2004. Examiners Cameron Saadat and Kathleen Christman were present to represent the U.S.P.T.O. During the interview, Claim 1 was discussed; more specifically, the portion of Claim 1 stating, “allowing a user to pull up a time-indexed point in a video *corresponding to a point in a* question.” (Emphasis not added). The Examiners contended that the aforementioned section of Claim 1 was confusing and that the terminology of the Claim was inconsistent. The Examiners recommended that the Claim be amended to use common terminology throughout the Claim. The Applicant proposes to amend the Claim to eliminate any confusion regarding the aforementioned phrase. Accordingly, below, the Examiner will find a response to the Office Action and the respective amended claims.

The Examiner also noted that the words exercise, course, and lesson were confusing and had recommended consolidating the terms. The Applicant would like to point out that each of these terms has its own significant meaning. Thus, they are not synonymous. For example, a course may be a mathematics course – a structured collection of lessons and assignments. A lesson is typically a smaller set of information delivered with an instructional design, and an exercise is a component of an assignment. Unlike lessons, assignments require some form of interaction or response, specified in the assignment’s exercises, from the assignee. The Applicant believes that the terms exercise, course, and lesson are all used appropriately in the Claims in accordance with their individual definitions.